

Applicant: Bill J. Coe
Serial No. 09/879,419
February 17, 2005

REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated August 17, 2004. In that Action, Claims 1-7, 10-12, 17, 18 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Calthrop in view of Peterson. Claims 1, 8-10, 13, 14, 17, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Booth in view of Snyder and Peterson. Claims 15, 16 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Calthrop in view of Peterson and further in view of Dennington. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's objections and rejections and offers the foregoing amendments and following remarks in support thereof.

Claims 1-24 remain pending in the Application.

Claims 1-7, 10-12, 17, 18 and 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Calthrop in view of Peterson. Applicant respectfully re-submits that there is absolutely no motivation to combine these two references.

Calthrop is not a one piece element like the present invention. Calthrop therefore has multiple pieces, thereby increasing manufacturing costs and being more complicated to assemble and use. Furthermore, Calthrop requires several separately manufactured elements, thereby increasing costs and connection points where there may be failure. Thus, since Calthrop teaches the need for a complicated structure, it in fact teaches away from the present invention.

As previously argued by Applicant, Calthrop is directed to a specially designed safety spring sling, which includes an extensible member that acts as a shock absorbing device. The

Applicant: Bill J. Coe
Serial No. 09/879,419
February 17, 2005

suspension lines are directly connected to safety hook 4 and the harness is directly connected to safety hook 5. Accordingly, the entire teaching and purpose of Calthrop is contained within the portion that the Examiner is eliminating by the proposed substitution with the Peterson structure. Thus, the proposed combination destroys the entire teaching of the Calthrop reference and is improper.

Also, Applicant maintains that there is no shock absorbing device left with the Examiner's proposed combination. Although Examiner states that there are shock absorbing characteristics to the Peterson strap for handling empty plastic jugs, no such element or qualities are disclosed. There mere fact that a reference is elongated does not automatically mean it has shock absorbing characteristics. Moreover, unlike the claimed invention, there is no interaction at all between the first end and the second end in the final configuration.

Applicant also incorporates by reference its other previous arguments regarding the Calthrop and Peterson references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-7, 10-12, 17, 18 and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Calthrop in view of Peterson.

Claims 1, 8-10, 13, 14, 17, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Booth in view of Snyder and Peterson. The invention in Booth is not directed to the attachment of the bridle cord to the pilot chute and canopy. Rather, Booth provides a complicated structure to deploy the main chute by the pilot chute.

Thus, Booth actually teaches away from the claimed invention, as it discloses a complex device having multiple parts and pieces which can fail with disastrous and tragic results.

Applicant: Bill J. Coe
Serial No. 09/879,419
February 17, 2005

Moreover, Booth teaches a cone (14) on a flap (26) for a parachute pack (10). There is no corresponding structure on the claimed device. Applicant also again respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's statement that Snyder discloses a parachute having a bridle cord. A "bridle cord" is a line that connects a pilot chute to the canopy. Snyder has nothing to do with bridle cords. Rather, Snyder teaches of a canopy design that eliminates the bottom sheet for better glide efficiency and reduced bulk.

Thus, there can be no motivation in Booth, Snyder or Peterson for the Examiner's proposed modifications. Applicant also incorporates by reference its above remarks regarding the Peterson reference and its previous remarks regarding the Booth, Snyder and Peterson references from prior Amendments for this Application. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1, 8-10, 13, 14, 17, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Booth in view of Snyder and Peterson.

Claims 15, 16 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Calthrop in view of Peterson and further in view of Dennington. Unlike the present invention, Dennington requires metal pieces (30, 64, 48) which can wear and fatigue. The Examiner even noted the relevant pieces in the Office Action. The present invention actually teaches away from the use of metals in parachute linkages.

Thus, there is no teaching regarding the qualities of the relevant type of link Dennington fails to correct the deficiencies of Calthrop and Peterson noted above. Providing Peterson's recyclable plastic jug strap in nylon, still fails to providing any motivation for substantially modifying the Calthrop reference and destroying the teachings of the Calthrop reference. Thus,

Applicant: Bill J. Coe
Serial No. 09/879,419
February 17, 2005

there is absolutely no motivation, teaching or suggestion for any of the Examiner's proposed combinations. Applicant also respectfully incorporates by reference its previous remarks regarding the Dennington reference made in prior amendments for this application including, but not limited to, the fact that Applicant respectfully submits that the Dennington reference is non-analogous art and not a proper Section 103 reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 15, 16 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Calthrop in view of Peterson and further in view of Dennington.

Applicant confirms that Applicant claims no new matter in the additional drawings provided. There are no new elements claimed, and the drawings merely reflect the current state of the art to illustrate the respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's objections to the drawings. Applicant respectfully submits that new matter is not introduced by the proposed drawings. The figures merely provide conventional devices known by those skilled in the art of parachute manufacturing. The circular element next to element 110 in Figures 16 and 17 are believed to be conventional rings and do not form part of the claimed invention. If the Examiner would prefer that the circular elements be removed to overcome the drawing objection, Applicant will make appropriate revisions to the drawings.

Applicant has completely responded to the Office Action dated August 17, 2004. Favorable action is respectfully requested.

Applicant: Bill J. Coe
Serial No. 09/879,419
February 17, 2005

If there are any additional charges, including extension of time, please bill our Deposit
Account No. 13-1130.

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph R. Englander, Reg. No. 38,871
Dale Paul DiMaggio, Reg. No. 31,823
MALIN, HALEY & DIMAGGIO, P.A.
CUSTOMER No. 22235
1936 South Andrews Ave.
Ft. Lauderdale, Florida 33316
Tel: (954) 763-3303
Fax: (954) 522-6507
E-Mail: INFO@mhdpatents.com

I:\7000\7282\Amend\4820(RCE).doc